



SHELL OIL COMPANY  
LEGAL - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
P.O. BOX 2463  
HOUSTON TX 77252-2463

**COPY MAILED**

FEB 01 2005

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Laurent Alain Michel Fenouil et al.  
Application No. 10/789,115  
Filed: February 27, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. TH185403(US)

:  
:DECISION ON PETITIONS  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) filed October 22, 2004, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional and provisional applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **DISMISSED AS MOOT**.

A petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000.

Along with the instant petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.76(a)(6), petitioner has submitted an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title to include a reference to the prior-filed applications.

The instant pending nonprovisional application was filed on February 27, 2004, and was pending at the time of filing of the instant petition. While a reference to the prior-filed applications was not included in an ADS or in the first sentence of the specification following the title, reference nevertheless was made in the transmittal letter filed with the above-identified application.

The current procedure where a claim for priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is not included in the first sentence of the specification or in an ADS but does appear either in the oath or declaration or a transmittal letter filed with the application and the Office notes the claim for priority, no petition will be required to accept a late claim for priority. This is because the application would have been scheduled for publication on the basis of the information concerning the claim submitted elsewhere in the application within the time period set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). However, on the other hand, if the USPTO does not note the claim for

priority to the prior-filed application(s) set forth in the oath or declaration or transmittal letter submitted with the application, a petition will be required to accept a late claim for priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6).<sup>1</sup> In the instant case, the Office noted the claim for priority of the prior-filed applications in the transmittal letter filed with the application, as shown by their inclusion on the filing receipt.

In view of the above, the \$130.00 petition fee submitted is unnecessary and will be refunded to petitioner's deposit account in due course.

Any questions concerning this decision on petition may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed the Technology Center.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 1764 for appropriate action on the amendment filed October 22, 2004, including consideration of the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5) for benefit of the prior-filed applications.



Frances Hicks  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

---

<sup>1</sup> Note MPEP 201.11 (V), page 200-75 (Rev. 1. Feb. 2004 and 66 Federal Register 67087 at 67089 (Dec. 28, 2001), effective December 28, 2001.